School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1388937

MODERN CRITICISM AND GENESIS.

Dr. REDPATH.

SPCK

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

MODERN CRITICISM

AND

THE BOOK OF GENESIS

MODERN CRITICISM

AND

THE BOOK OF GENESIS

BS
1235
R4

BY

HENRY A. REDPATH, D.LITT., M.A.

RECTOR OF ST. DUNSTAN'S IN THE EAST, LONDON, AND GRINFIELD LECTURER IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE TRACT COMMITTEE

LONDON:
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE,
NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.; 43, QUEEN VICTORIA STREET, E.C.
BRIGHTON: 129, NORTH STREET.
NEW YORK: E. S. GORHAM.
1905

MATRI MEAE DILECTISSIMAE
MEORUM A PUERITIA BIBLICORUM STUDIORUM
FAUTRICI.

University of Southern California

Rel. 222.1 R321m

PREFACE

Transferred
Methodist World Service Fund

In what I have had to say in the following pages, I have followed the order in which the subject is treated by Dr. Driver in his book on *Genesis*, because it is no doubt the book on the subject that is being most widely read at the present moment and is more universally accepted than any other. This is due to the undoubted encyclopædic knowledge of the author, on the one hand, and, on the other, to the innate reverence with which he approaches Biblical problems. But this ought not to blind us to what I believe to be an undoubted fact, that there is much to be said in favour of a more conservative view of *Genesis* than that of Dr. Driver, and that it deserves attention, though at the present moment many minds seem bewitched by the glamour of the great names that are invoked upon the other side, and are ready to take much as proved about which it would be far better, for the present, to suspend judgment. The general trend of opinion at the present time about the Criticism of the New Testament as compared with that of a few decades back goes far, at any

330541

rate, to prove the wisdom of this course. The number of details which have to be gone into in the treatment of a subject of such great difficulty may perhaps deter some readers, who are anxious to arrive rapidly at general conclusions, from following the arguments fully. But it must be remembered that the conclusions of the modern critic are derived from particular details, and if the grounds upon which the conclusions are built are proved to be mistaken or wrong, the truth of the conclusion fails of being established.

The substance of the greater part of this book appeared in a series of articles in the *Churchman* in 1904.

MODERN CRITICISM

AND

THE BOOK OF GENESIS

THE publication of Dr. Driver's book on Genesis, in the series called the *Westminster Commentaries*, edited by Dr. Lock, coming as it does after a long interval, during which no leading commentary on this book, which has continued to hold the field, has appeared in England, will naturally arouse a fresh interest in the many debatable subjects which gather around its treatment, and perhaps call for their reconsideration or their retreatment on other lines.

One thing we may be quite sure of—that in the treatment of the subject in hand, neither the general editor of the series nor the editor of this particular book would tolerate anything but reverential handling of a book which both alike would declare to have manifest in it "the presence . . . of the purifying and illuminating Spirit of God" (Pref., p. xi).

The Book of Genesis touches at various points, science, archæology, and history. What, then, are the students of these subjects to say? We should be inclined to put statements on their behalf into the following form:

1. The scientific student may say: "This is certainly not a scientific manual in any sense of the word; its account of natural phenomena does not claim to be scientific, and is clothed in other than scientific language. You must not look in it, then, for scientific statements." This is obvious, just as it is clear that the connection between proper names and the explanation given of them is not governed by the rules of scientific philology. It is much more of the nature of paronomasia.

At the same time, the non-scientific man must not be alarmed by some of the statements made on behalf of science. Science has not arrived on all points at absolute truth. It has very often to use working hypotheses from which to start. Those hypotheses do sometimes break down, and even when they do not there may be something behind them still to be discovered which may tell us more, and give us higher and more absolute knowledge than the hypotheses do. The scientific discoveries of the last few years show us how much almost certainly still lies outside the range of scientific knowledge.

2. It is a little rash for the historical student to demand adequate *contemporary* support before com-

mencing to build. Let it be as limited as you like as to time and place, but there surely must be some room for tradition and what it tells us. The amount of scope you may give to tradition will vary, but, after all, a considerable amount of history would have to be blotted out if we were only allowed to use "adequate contemporary support." And then comes in the question: "What do you mean by adequate?" Various views are taken of the same events in history by various historians, very often because they have been biassed by their own predilections, or for some other reasons, in favour of one "contemporary support" rather than another, and have held that to be adequate. Moreover, the particular object of the historian has also to be considered. This leads him in the selection of what he is to record. The historical student must therefore say:—"Even though what I am reading is not the actual evidence of a contemporary, still I am bound to see what it can teach me as to times preceding the period of the actual compiler."

3. No positive statement can be put into the mouth of the archæological student. It is difficult, perhaps, to distinguish between him and the historical student. We do know, at any rate, what the archæological student must not say. Sometimes his monuments of other archaic remains will appear to tell a story different from that of the Bible. The great temptation is for him to rule that the monuments must be right and the Bible

wrong. This he must not do; and we are entitled to ask him to maintain a judicious suspense as between conflicting records. It is what we are obliged to do even in the present day when during a state of war conflicting accounts of the same event, officially narrated, reach us from the opposing sides.

In this little volume I propose to discuss some of the subjects that must necessarily come up for discussion in any treatment of this most important portion of our Bible. I propose to deal with these subjects very much in the order in which they occur in Professor Driver's book, and to begin with the

Structure of the Book.

No one who reads the book, and considers what it claims to be, can help admitting that, whether, putting out of consideration some few later insertions, it was written by Moses, or in part by some one quite or nearly contemporary with him, or is a composite production gradually put together, it must in all reason have had authorities or sources behind it. It could scarcely be contended that all the information contained in it was a matter of directly Heaven-sent revelation. This is not the way in which God has ever dealt with men. He makes use of men and of men's works as they are. At the same time, this does not exclude a Divine revelation of things which could not have been known in any other way. If, for instance, there is

an authentic account of the beginning of all things —we are not at present saying whether there is or is not—but if there is, it cannot be anything else than a Divine revelation. If it is not, then it is a fiction of the human mind.

But we have been tempted into a digression from our present subject. There are two ways in which a history based upon previous sources can be constructed. A historian can take those sources and construct from them a harmonious whole, which, however, will still bear traces of its origin. This is the natural process, and one which is constantly made use of. His own personal bias will lead the historian to make some features of his narrative preponderate, while others will be more in the shade. That is the way in which modern historians work, and it is the way in which the Books of Kings and Chronicles were compiled, though at different dates. The Books of Chronicles have a priestly tinge about them, and deal exclusively, or almost so, with the affairs of the kingdom of Judah. On the other hand, the Books of Kings have in many sections the atmosphere of the Northern Kingdom about them, and do not deal with much matter which the sacerdotalist editor of the Chronicles has introduced into his work. But both works alike profess to be based upon previous chronicles and records. Each compiler has made his selection, and that, too, from various authorities and in such a way as to suit what the Germans call his own *tendenz*.

But there is another possible way of constructing a history, and that is more what we may call a scissors-and-paste method. According to it, one document is taken after it has been in existence, we will say, for a hundred years, then it is cut up into paragraphs after a second document has been written, and parts of the second document are wedged in between paragraphs of the first, whilst others are pasted over parts of the first, so that you can only guess whether there is a superimposed portion over an underlying one, or whether there is merely blank paper below the portion of the second document. After another century this process is repeated again, and later insertions still are made. And when all this is done, a later compiler or redactor smooths over the points of junction between the pasted fragments, and the whole work is accepted as if it had always been the same, and not a word is breathed about the multifarious processes that the final work has undergone, lasting up to or even past (?) the time when a translation of the whole is made into another language in which the only difference of any importance is a dislocation in the order of six chapters out of 187.

This is, in effect, the treatment that has produced the Pentateuch according to the current view of to-day; and so well was the final editing done that about 2000 years from the date at which the Pentateuch is certainly known to have been in existence in its present form had to elapse before a

suspicion of such a state of things began to arise.

The reasons for the persistent advocacy of this view are not far to seek, and some of them have more to do with the contents and structure of the other books of the Pentateuch than with Genesis. Those who hold it cannot allow that the great lawgiver's powers of foresight were so great that he could look forward from the wandering nomad existence of the wilderness to a settled state, and in parts of his code provide for circumstances very different from those which were provided for at the beginning of his legislative period. They cannot allow that St. Stephen was right when he said that "Moses was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," even though it is E (the second, in point of time, of the sources) that tells us that Moses was brought up as if he were of royal blood, and, therefore, in a country like Egypt, would receive a considerable education.

The facts that "(1) the same event is doubly recorded; (2) the language, and frequently the representation as well, varies in different sections" (Introd., p. iii), may be true, but that does not oblige us *per se* to make the earliest of the documents, which is the source of the Pentateuch, date only from the ninth century B.C.

The question of real or apparent differences in these duplications is a separate matter altogether. The various uses of the Divine names are susceptible of more interpretations than one, and, judging by

the way in which they are translated in the LXX,[1] point either to a more varying use of those names in the Hebrew text before it was settled as we have it, or, perhaps, to a modernization to make it agree with the current use of the time when the Hebrew text was settled. But this, again, can be discussed without any *à priori* view as to date, as can the phraseology. And with regard to phraseology, it must be remembered that the Hebrew Bible gives us the whole of the extant Hebrew literature of the period, on any mode of reckoning, to which it belongs, and therefore a discussion of phraseology must have its limitations, from the nature of the case. Such a modernization as we have mentioned above is quite within the regions of possibility in phraseology, as in other matters, and is certainly indicated in no obscure way in the account of the reading of the Torah by Ezra and his companions (Neh. viii. 8), and perhaps traces of it may remain in some of the variants given in the Massoretic Bible.

We are concerned in the present paper with Genesis alone, and we think we may take it that there are no passages in it which "reflect the ideas and embody the institutions which were characteristic of widely different periods of Israelitish history" (Introd., p. xvi). At any rate, Dr. Driver does not give us any, for he allows, as is no doubt

[1] See an article by the present writer, "A new Theory as to the use of the Divine Names in the Pentateuch," in the *American Journal of Theology*, April 1904.

generally allowed, that certain isolated verses (*e.g.* Gen. xxxvi. 31) may have easily been marginal notes that have found their way into the text. It is, of course, one of the difficulties of the treatment of part of a greater subject that such a point must be left undiscussed; but, we repeat, there is nothing in Genesis, putting these isolated verses on one side, and remembering how limited the whole extent of Hebrew literature is, to necessitate such a late date as the ninth century B.C., to say nothing of later dates still.

With regard to the name Yahweh, Dr. Driver makes this allowance—that it is probable that, "though not absolutely new in Moses' time, it was still current previously only in a limited circle" (Introd., p. xix). The present writer's view is that in the pre-Mosaic times "Yah" existed side by side with "Elohim" (Exod. xv. 2); that on the emerging of the Jewish people as a nation the name was at first יהיה, a form which agrees with (1) the explanation of the name given in Exod. iii.; (2) the archaic reproduction of it in the Hexapla; (3) the abbreviated form of the tetragrammaton in Hebrew manuscripts; (4) its appearance, it may be, in Isa. xxxviii. 11, where dittography has been invoked to explain the occurrence of יהיה, and that only later did the form יהיה become יהוה.[1]

So far as Genesis is concerned, then, the origin of the book may be due to several sources, but there is nothing to compel us, treating that book

[1] For a fuller treatment of this subject, see p. 85.

by itself, to give it a later date than the traditional one.

If, then, we allow that Genesis has within it evidence of having been based upon previously existing documents or records, we have next to investigate the question whether those documents, as used by the author of this book, present us with a harmonious whole or are discordant in the story which they tell. The following are

Alleged Discrepancies between the Sources.

1. The narratives of chaps. i. 1 to ii. 4*a* and ii. 4*b* to 25. The first discrepancy mentioned is this: "The earth, instead of emerging from the waters (as in i. 9), is represented as being at first *dry* (ii. 5)—too dry, in fact, to support vegetation" (p. 35). It would scarcely be gathered from this statement that in chap. i. 9 the command is "Let the *dry* land appear," and that the first meaning given to the root verb from which the adjective is derived in the new Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, on the title-page of which the Oxford Professor of Hebrew's name appears, is "to be dried up without moisture" (the word which is used in chap. viii. 14 of the surface of the earth after nearly two months' exposure to the atmosphere after the flood, the word for its state when first it was exposed being a different one; see chap. viii. 13). The united idea of the two passages is something like this: The appearance of land from

out of the waters; its saturated condition prevents growth; then its gradual drying, which if it had continued indefinitely would equally have prevented growth; then the mist, which makes a regular growth of herbs and plants possible. We have nothing to do here with what science may have to say as to the process indicated. What we do say is that the two accounts are not contradictory.

The second discrepancy alleged in this same narrative is that "the first step in the process of filling it with living forms is the creation of man ii. 7), then follows that of beasts (verse 19), and, lastly, that of woman (verses 21 *et seq.*)—obviously a different order from that of chap. i." (p. 35). But surely there is nothing of the systematic order of creation intended here. Just as much of the creation work as is needed for the immediate purpose is mentioned, and no more. Thus, when the naming of the animals is to be recorded, as their creation has not been mentioned already by this source, it is now set down. The various clauses of chap. ii. 19 are not necessarily contemporaneous. If we insert the personal pronoun before the word "brought" in the Revised Version—as we have a perfect right to do—this is made clearer. "The Lord God formed," etc.—that is one transaction. "And [He] brought them," etc.—that is another. We need not labour the question about the place in order of the creation of woman; it is admitted that, *if it stood alone*, it is capable of reasonable explanation. The only other point is the different conceptions

of God. But so long as the two conceptions do not contradict or exclude one another, both are admissible. After all, if one source says "God said," and the other "God breathed," is not the language in both cases anthropomorphic, and do not both postulate a mouth for God? And if the narrative be read without prejudice, we cannot see that the Divine presence is "locally determined" within the limits of the garden. Certainly, in chapter iv., ascribed to the same source (J), the Lord is present and converses with Cain.

2. The number of animals taken into the ark, seven of each clean kind, two of every kind clean and unclean. Here, again, it is surely clear that the lesser number does not exclude the greater in particular circumstances, and that, in fact, such a greater number was imperatively necessary if the rite of sacrifice, which already subsisted (iv. 4), was to be kept up immediately on the exodus from the ark, otherwise the perpetuation of the various species could not have been secured. The two narrators, therefore, had two distinct objects in view—one thought simply of the providential perpetuation of animal life, the other of that and of the dutiful service of God which was required to be carried out.

3. The two promises of a son for Sarah—one to Abraham by himself, a second a reiteration of the promise to Abraham which Sarah overhears in the tent-door. The following statement is made about the two passages involved (xvii. 16–19, xviii. 9–15):

" . . . The terms used in xviii. 9–15 clearly showing that the writer did not picture any promise of the same kind as having been given to Abraham" (Introd., p. iii). We certainly cannot follow this. The second promise to Abraham is more definite as to time than the first; and the asseveration "I will certainly return unto thee" (verse 10) contains an implied allusion to something that has preceded. Moreover, on the second occasion Abraham neither laughs nor expresses any incredulity. We are also told that there is "an accompanying double explanation of the origin of the name *Isaac*." This is pure assumption, for the name "Isaac" is never mentioned in the second narrative, though in both cases laughter is mentioned; and husband and wife received the announcement of the birth of a son on the occasion of their first hearing it, as was perhaps natural, in much the same spirit.

4. As to the motives used to persuade Jacob to depart from Canaan and their discrepancy, there is surely a lack of knowledge of human nature. Have we never ourselves tried to influence a person towards a course of action by suggesting first one motive and then another when the first suggestion has failed of its object? Can we not imagine Jacob's saying, when flight from his brother's wrath is suggested to him, No brother of mine is going to drive me away from home; and yet, when another motive is suggested—that of getting a wife for himself—his being ready to go?

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL
OF THEOLOGY LIBRARY

5. As to double explanations of proper names, Jacob might well look upon his second vision as confirming what he had already expressed belief in that the place was the house of God—Bethel. And as to the name "Israel," what is indicated is perhaps that Jacob had not accepted the use of the name the first time of its being given ; at any rate, we find Jacob called Israel almost immediately after the second occasion (xxxv. 21).

6. Lastly, it is stated that "in xxxii. 3 and xxxiii. 16 Esau is described as already resident in Edom, whereas in xxxvi. 6 *et seq.* his migration thither is attributed to causes which could not have come into operation until after Jacob's return to Canaan" (Introd., p. iv). Here, again, the extremely wandering character of the life of patriarchal times, as described thoughout in Genesis, is ignored. Nothing is said—at any rate in the earlier passages —of permanent settlement. In the first Esau is for the time in Seir ; in the second he is on his way to Seir. It is only the third passage that speaks of anything but temporary residence.

After careful examination, then, of the alleged passages, we cannot admit that there is anything in them which compels us to admit that any one is contrary to any other, though they may very probably be derived from different original documents.

The next point which comes before us for consideration in dealing with our subject is

The Chronology of Genesis,

and the first question to be treated is, "Are the sources of the author's information consistent with one another, or are they not?" The destructive Critic says not. It is therefore necessary to examine the passages upon which he relies for the establishment of his position. The passages cited must be taken one by one and examined. This is tiresome work, but it is the only way in which the assertion can be tested.

1. xii. 11: It is objected that Abram could not have called his wife "a fair woman to look upon" (J) when she was sixty-five years of age (P; deduced from a comparison of xii. 4 with xvii. 17. We scarcely think, though considerable stress is laid upon it in the commentary, that this objection should be taken seriously. If it stood by itself it certainly would be held to be of little avail, and therefore, if we can be considered to have satisfactorily disposed of the other counts in the indictment, the question of the possibility of personal beauty in a woman at a particular age can be safely treated as a negligible quantity.

2. xxi. 15: It is objected in this case that, when we are told that Hagar "cast" Ishmael under a shrub in the desert, the word implies that she was carrying him, and that this was a physical impossibility, as he was at least fifteen years old. To begin with, supposing Hagar was carrying him, it does not follow that she had carried him for any

long distance, and it is within the experience of some of us what physical strength women are sometimes endowed with in times of stress. But further the word "cast" does not "clearly imply" a carrying of the boy. Joseph's brothers did not carry him to the pit into which they cast him (xxxvii. 24; the Hebrew word is the same). It is just as easy to assume that Hagar supported her fainting boy for some little distance and then made him lie down under a shrub whilst she went a little way off as it is to assume that she was carrying him.

3. xxiv. 67: The objection this time is that it is unnatural to suppose that Isaac would have mourned for his mother for three years. Here again there is nothing but pure assumption. Family affection is throughout the book represented as very strong; and in a later passage, if we are content to take it as it stands, Jacob is represented as sorrowing for Joseph for more than thirteen years (*cp.* xxxvii. 2 with xli. 46) after he had supposed him to be torn in pieces by wild beasts. I cannot find, however, that Dr. Driver objects to his grief as impossible.

4. xxvii.: The inconsistency alleged with regard to this chapter is that in it "Isaac is to all appearance, according to the representation of the narrator (J), upon his death-bed (*cp.* verse 2)," and yet that, according to P, he lived for eighty, or, at any rate, for forty-three, years afterwards. In the one case Isaac would be at this time 100 years old, in the other 137. Now, what does the narrative really

say? It depicts to us Isaac as an old man, with sight gone to such an extent that he could not distinguish between his two sons. In his condition, in an age of the world when artificial aids to feeble sight were not available, he is unable to fulfil many of the duties of the head of the family, and his helplessness makes him realize the uncertainty of life. There is not a word about a death-bed. All he wants to make sure of is that before he dies his son shall have his blessing and the privileges of succession secured to him. It is his helplessness more than any idea of immediately impending death that urges him on; and it is this very helplessness of the blind old patriarch which is the reason why we read nothing more of him till we have the account of his death (xxxv. 27–29).

A further difficulty is suggested about the age of Jacob when he fled to Haran, as compared with the date when Esau took his Hittite wives (xxvi. 34). But it has always seemed to me that there is an easy explanation of this, and that is that, by some accident to the MSS., xxvi. 34, 35 (ascribed to P) has been misplaced, and ought to come immediately before xxvii. 46, where the same authority (P) is resorted to again. Jacob would then be only forty (*not* seventy-seven) when he fled to Haran. Nobody, I suppose, would ever contend that such a misplacement was impossible.

5. xxxv. 8: We are told in this verse of the death of Rebekah's nurse, Deborah, and as a nameless nurse is said to have come into Palestine

with Rebekah 140 years previously (xxiv. 59), it is assumed that the two persons must be the same, and that therefore there is an inconsistency here between J and E. That Rebekah had but one nurse is a pure assumption. We are told how long Rebekah lived; and it is quite possible that Deborah was a much later and younger dependent of Rebekah than the nameless nurse of the earlier passage. Dr. Driver expresses surprise (p. 309) at "the sudden appearance of Rebekah's nurse in Jacob's company." Yet how often may we read in the obituary notices in our newspapers of the deaths of very old nurses or other servants, who have lived on to be the beloved and trusted confidantes of those whose children they had helped to bring up.

6. xxxviii.: Here, again, we are told that there is "a grave chronological discrepancy between P and JE" (p. 365), because of the position of the narrative after the selling of Joseph into Egypt. But although it appears in that particular position, the note of time "at that time" is very indefinite. More than one reasonable explanation of its position might be given. Dr. Driver would allow us to put back the narrative "(say) ten years." Why we may not put it further back still he does not say. But its position here may, at any rate, be due to one of the following reasons: Joseph is to be the leading character of the next chapters. Before, then, his brethren are lost sight of, Judah, who is a very important personage in the source J, must

have his line of descent carried forward, especially as regal power is attributed to him (xlix. 8–12). And the place for the insertion is suggested by the part Judah plays in the previous chapter (xxxvii. 26). Or it may be that the cause for its insertion in its present position is that the scene of action is shifted to Egypt, and the writer—for the source of the greater part of xxxvii. as well as of xxxviii. is J—is anxious to close the record of Jacob's sons in Palestine.

7. xliv. 20: It is objected as inconsistent that this verse speaks of Benjamin as "a child of" Jacob's "old age, a little one," whereas in xlvi. 21 he is represented as the father of ten sons (whilst in the LXX he is the father of three sons and seven grandsons). To this it may be answered that the word "child" does not necessarily imply an infant. It is translated—*e.g.* by R.V. in Gen. iv. 23—"a young man." And, further, "a little one" may just as well mean one that need not be taken into account, "insignificant." The form of the Hebrew word is different in its Massoretic pointing from that translated "youngest," and applied to Benjamin in xlii. 13 (E), and it is noticeable that it is used in the sense of "insignificant" of tribal Benjamin (1 Sam. ix. 21). It would, then, be a word put by Judah into his own and his ten brothers' mouths, as if to draw off (the unrecognized) Joseph's attention from him as one not worth thinking about.

I venture to think that, after all, something still

remains to be said in support of the consistency of the narrative of Genesis with itself, though it may be derived from different sources. It is tiresome unravelling the threads of the tangle that we are presented with by the critics, which would not very often occur to an ordinary reader; but it is hoped that something has been done towards the solution of some of the difficulties, at any rate.

But another question which is much more widely-reaching remains to be answered: "Is the chronology of Genesis, if, and in so far as, it is consistent with itself, consistent with such external data as we possess for fixing the chronology of the period embraced in the Book?" (Introd., p. xxv).

We will take for granted that there are more notes of time in P than in the other sources. There is nothing unreasonable in that. If we compare various histories of the same period together we shall find that dates and chronological tables occupy much more space in one than in another. But is it quite fair to say that in P there is a systematic chronology running through the Book from the beginning almost to the end?

To begin with, it is quite clear that corruption of the numerals, or symbols for the numerals, involved must have set in at a very early date. So confused have they become that, taking the Massoretic text of the Hebrew, the Septuagint version (a translation of a Hebrew text older than the Massoretic text), and the Samaritan version, the figures show a widely-varying reckoning. If they are treated

simply as figures to be added together, and from them a "systematic chronology" is to be evolved, we have to make our choice as to the length of time from the Creation of Man to the Call of Abraham between 2021, 2322 and 3407 years respectively. It will be observed that the last of these is nearly one and three-quarter times as long again as the first.

The fact is that there is no "systematic chronology" at all for these early periods. It is nowhere said: So many years elapsed from the Creation of Man to the Flood; or, So many years elapsed from the Flood to the Call of Abraham.

No! what we have got are two *systematized genealogical tables* (Gen. v.; xi. 10–26), if you like to call them by that name.

Let me put the information which these give us in another form:

So all the generations from Adam unto Noah are ten generations; and from Noah unto the removal to Canaan are ten generations.

It will at once, I think, be obvious why I have put my statement in this form. There is a Book of Genesis (*βίβλος γενέσεως*) at the opening of the New Testament. That part of our Bible begins with a genealogical table, and the summing up of it is expressed as follows:

So all the generations from Abraham unto David are fourteen generations; and from David unto the carrying away (R.V. marg. "removal") *to Babylon fourteen generations; and from the carrying away*

to Babylon unto the Christ fourteen generations (St. Matt. i. 17).

Now, no one contends that this latter statement is exhaustive of all the generations. The author of the table of descent condensed it to secure the three twice sevens and thus make up his three sets of fourteen generations. This is universally acknowledged, and no one has ever ventured to question the historicity of St. Matthew's Gospel—at any rate, in its broadest outlines—because of the statement of the verse I have quoted, and that notwithstanding that there is not the shadow of an indication, so far as the book itself is concerned, that there is any such omission.

Such a harping, as it were, upon numbers find its place also in the Old Testament. In these two tables we have symmetry introduced by the occurrence of the number "ten" in both. We can find, moreover, at least one hint that the incomplete character of the genealogies was recognized. In the Septuagint version of Gen. xi. we find an extra name inserted—Kainan—between Arpachshad and Shelah, with the two statements of years lived before and after he begat a son; and this additional name duly appears in St. Luke's genealogy of our Lord.

If this view be once accepted, then the whole theory that the chronology of Genesis is inconsistent with extra-Biblical chronology, and is a strong argument for the non-historicity of the book, topples over—at any rate, so far as the pre-Abra-

hamitic times are concerned. The tables are intended, in a condensed form, to lead us down the path of the world's history to the time of the selection of the individual from whom was to spring the elect people of God. The difficulty about the development of tribes and cities between the Babel incident and the times of Abraham will disappear; the date of the Flood will fall in much more exactly with the Babylonian tablets; and the ten patriarchs will be parallel to the ten mythic antediluvian heroes with immensely longer lives of the ante-Xisuthros, and therefore antediluvian, times.

There remain, of course, two great difficulties connected with these two genealogical statements: (1) The fact that each of the patriarchs' lives is divided into sections. But with regard to this we are in no worse position than any other school of critics, for all alike have to allow that "it is an artificial system, which must have been arrived at in some way by computation, though the data upon which it was calculated have not at present been ascertained" (Introd., p. xxx). (2) The length of life ascribed to the antediluvian patriarchs. This question is inextricably mixed up with the previous one, and our ignorance of the mode of computation adopted by the author or compiler of the source called P. The possibility of such a length for human life is a subject to be discussed under some different heading from the present one. It may be that the great number of years of life ascribed in the first table to the antediluvian patriarchs is a

faint reflection of the tradition that an innumerable number of centuries had passed over the world before the cataclysm described in Gen. vi.–ix.

If this view of the genealogical statements be accepted, we are not only not precluded from placing the Flood much earlier in the world's history than the date which a simple addition of the years of the postdiluvian patriarchs from Noah to Abraham would give us, but it would also give a longer period for development and for arriving at such a state of things as we find in Abraham's time.

With regard to the rest of the book, we can only deduce one period, that from the call of Abraham to the going down of Jacob into Egypt, which is generally accepted as amounting to 215 years. The next difficulty is, of course, the length of the sojourn in Egypt; but that question does not fall within our present subject, depending as it does entirely upon passages outside the Book of Genesis (Exod. i. 11; xii. 40, 41; 1 Kings vi. 1), the only allusion to it in this book being the mention in a prophecy (xv. 13) of a period of 400 years of affliction in a strange land, and of a return in the fourth generation.

The fact is that there is demanded of the author of Genesis or the authors of the sources from which that book is derived a systematic chronology which would have been quite out of keeping with the times about which he or they wrote. Numbers do not seem to have been accurately dealt with by the copyists of Hebrew manuscripts. Letters took

the place of figures, and one letter was easily confused with another. Universally admitted cases of this are to be found in other periods of Jewish history (*e.g.* see 1 Sam. xiii., and *cp.* 2 Kings viii. 26 with 2 Chron. xxii. 2). If this be so in documents which have to do with history of a much later date, it is surely not too much to ask that we should not be nailed down to accepting two statements which do not agree, as if there were no room for a mistake to have crept in.

An attempt is being made in these articles to meet the statements of the destructive critics on their own ground. I have, therefore, accepted for argumentative purposes, the generally accepted division of Genesis amongst its sources, though I do not accept the dates to which they are assigned, and I have not attempted to make any independent analysis of the book.

If the view which I have submitted as to the so-called system of chronology of the pre-Abrahamic times commends itself to the reader, or has any verisimilitude, the question of the antiquity of man will be one upon which the Bible will give us no information. It leaves us quite at liberty to accept whatever definite results the researches of science in this direction may establish. The scientific student can enter upon his investigations in a perfectly independent spirit, and with no idea that any conclusions he may arrive at will be counted as evidence either for or against the Bible narrative. In the same way, an indefinite or illimitable time

is left for the development, so far as is necessary, of different languages and racial distinctions.

But a word of caution is also necessary, especially because those who accept the doctrine of evolution—I am not concerned for the moment with its truth or not—are only ready to accept it so far as it coincides with their own views. For if evolution and development mean anything, it is that by slow degrees stage after stage of development has led to higher and higher forms of life. If you are an evolutionist, you must believe that at some stage or other from the *anthropoid* mammal was physically evolved the mammal we called *anthropos;* if you do not believe that, you are no evolutionist, and have to allow that there is a gap in your system of evolution. At the same time, you are confronted by the fact that, in every known case, the mental powers and spiritual gifts of the *anthropos* are in varying degrees, yet still always capable of being distinguished from (though it is not always possible to define accurately in human language the difference) the highest form of animal intelligence. You ask the man of science, When did this difference arise? He cannot tell you. He may be able to tell you of certain implements of a rude kind found hard by the skeletons in the drift gravel of the Pleistocene period, when remains of man first appear ; but the skeletons themselves reveal but little as to the stage of mental, and nothing as to that of moral, development which the animal man had reached. Besides, no other

animal possesses the gift of language in the sense in which man does. Where did these gifts come from? and how did they arise? Science cannot tell us, and the remains discovered can give no information.

Now, to one who looks at things of that sort *ab extra* it seems that, if you take for the moment the principle of evolution as a working hypothesis to explain how this world of ours is ordered, you are only at the beginning of your difficulties. I am speaking now as one taking cognizance of such matters from outside. For instance, let it be granted that *anthropos* is evolved from *anthropoid.* This does not involve necessarily all the *anthropoids* of the same species; there are some left behind. It is only the fittest *anthropoid* that becomes the *anthropos.* Some of the *anthropoids* survive and perpetuate their species. How long is this to go on? and is it possible that, after all, there may be an inferior race which looks like *anthropos*, but is really *anthropoid?* Do we not find, for instance, in more districts than one in Africa, mammals that we class as *anthropos*, but that, if we had a free hand, we should class with the *anthropoids?* And, if this or anything like it be so, is there not suggested by it something like an answer to the *vexata quæstio* of the union between "the sons of God" and "the daughters of men"? May it not be possible that union was possible between an *anthropos* and an *anthropoid* of this left-behind race, and, also, that, in certain cases, the influence

of the *anthropos* would be sufficient to make the resultant progeny rather of the *anthropos* type than of the *anthropoid?* In this way, might not only the fact that, if, as with most scientists, the universality of the Flood is not accepted, we meet with what we should call degraded races still surviving in the world, be accounted for, but also the fact that, when the *anthropos* meets in a struggle for survival with such races, such inferior race, as in Australia and North America, dies out? In this way, too, or in some way like it, the old question asked by the scoffer, as to who Cain's wife was, may find its answer. I am particularly anxious not to dogmatize on these scientific subjects. I only throw these statements out as suggestions, in order to show how, in many ways, we are merely at present at the threshold of a great question, which, with all its difficulties, we may perhaps meet again later on in our investigations.[1]

In his introduction Dr. Driver discusses

The Patriarchal Period.

We are anxious to quote here one sentence from that discussion :

[1] (1) For one of the latest discussions on this subject see *Anthropozoon Biblicum*, by J. Lanz-Liebenfels, in which, amongst other things, the author, whether rightly or wrongly I do not say, comes to the conclusion that the *Behemoth* of Job " is an anthropoid animal, and a remnant of the early cohabitation of man and animals " (*i.e.* I suppose anthropoids). —See *American Journal of Theology*, January 1905, p. 174. I have not seen the book itself.

"The supposition that the writer (or writers) of Genesis may have based his (or their) narratives upon written documents, contemporary with the events described, does not alter the case: there is no evidence, direct or indirect, that such documents were actually used as the basis of the narrative; and upon a *mere* hypothesis, for the truth of which no positive grounds can be alleged, and which therefore may or may not be true, it must be apparent that no further conclusions of any value can be built" (p. xliii).

I quote these words in full because, if I understand them aright, there seems to me to lie hid in them a great fallacy. (1) To begin with, there is no evidence outside the Book of Genesis itself of documents having existed either contemporary or non-contemporary; (2) there is no evidence of such documents having been actually used; (3) there is certainly no direct evidence, at any rate as to Genesis, of their being non-contemporary, as the destructive critics contend; and (4) their whole position is based upon a *mere* hypothesis, which may or may not be true, and it must be apparent that upon it no further conclusion of any value can be built. Certainly there are no conclusions sufficiently sure to "seriously diminish the confidence which we might otherwise feel as regards the historical character of the patriarchal narratives" (p. xliii).

Whilst we are, at the end of the discussion, left in rather a nebulous state as to the historic person-

ality of the patriarchs, we are given enough statements to make us cling to a belief in them as real persons. The tenacity of memory amongst an unliterary people; the agreement on the whole of the two independent narratives J and E; the sobriety of these narratives; the great moderation in the claims made on behalf of the patriarchs; the fact that, though promised the land, they never take possession of it; the fact also that Moses, the great lawgiver, is not made the starting-point of the "Israelitish tradition"—all these will suffice, surely, to satisfy the mind of an ordinary reader of such an unsophisticated narrative (to say nothing of the accuracy of the topography and of the descriptions of Eastern life, which Dr. Driver says must not be taken for evidence) of its historicity.

The next point about which something must be said is

Tribes represented as Individuals.

On this point Dr. Driver writes with much more reserve and caution than some critics. The absurdities, for they can be called no less, to which some have been led in this regard, can be best estimated when we say that one critic has pronounced Rachel and Leah (the wives of Jacob, according to the narrative as it has come down to us) to be "a distinction without a difference," and both names to be "corrupt fragments of Jerahmeel" (*Encyc. Bibl.*, 4004).

But even the more moderate statements must

be carefully examined. Thus, Dr. Driver says: "Bethuel is mentioned as an individual . . . but his brothers Uz and Buz are tribes" (Introd., p. liv). But they are not said to be tribes in xxii. 21, but stand on exactly the same level as Bethuel. It is true that the names became the names of tribes and countries, but it does not necessarily follow that the tribe had not an eponymous founder; we certainly have no right to deny the existence of such persons. The Arabian tribes of the desert still look back to eponymous founders, just as, I suppose, the Scotch clans, which still remain so clannish, do. This will apply equally well to Dr. Driver's next assertion: "Keturah . . . is spoken of as Abraham's second wife (xxv.); but her sons and grandsons are tribes (xxv. 2–4)," (p. liv). This, again, is not said, though it is implied by what is said (xxv. 6), that they were the founders of tribes. Again, in referring to Gen x. (p. liv), the English reader is not told what, indeed, he is told elsewhere (p. 112), but ought to be repeated here, that the names can be classified as personal names, local names, and tribal names with either a plural or gentile termination. These differences must surely have had some meaning to the original compiler of the list, or, at any rate, in the sources from which he derived his list, whether they were oral or written. It is clear that in later times the children of an eponymous ancestor were called either "the children of the person," or, for shortness' sake, by his name. Thus, in Num.

xxxii. 39, 40 (JE), we have the same people called "the children of Machir" (ver. 39) and "Machir" (ver. 40), both, be it observed, in the same source. In Num. xxvi. 29, the next passage quoted, it is said "Machir . . . begets (the country) Gilead" (p. liv), but the insertion of the words "the country" is quite arbitrary. The passage about Jephthah is more difficult (see Judg. xi. 2), but I incline to think that the passage is much plainer if we read איש גלעד instead of גלעד in the latter part of ver. 1, and translate "and a Gileadite begat Jephthah. And a woman of Gilead bare him sons." What is said above may be said, generally speaking, of the rest of the instances quoted (p. liv); and in treating some of them there is a lack of appreciation of the poetical surroundings in which they occur. The use of the same word for a country and its people is not limited to the Semitic languages. We say, for instance, England was victorious, meaning "the English people."

At this point I think we may pause to notice how the spirit of quite a different form of interpretation recurs in the lucubrations of modern writers, who do away with the personality of the patriarchs, and look upon the account of them as a parabolical account of the history of tribes. Time was when people thought less of the actual history of the patriarchs and their real place in the affairs of their times, and more of them as types of the coming Messiah. They pressed their typical

interpretation so far that even, for instance, the number of Abraham's "trained men" (Gen. xiv. 14) was held to be capable of a mystical interpretation. The result of this was that any typology in the Old Testament was discredited. Now, I should be the last person to say that there are no types to be found in the Old Testament. No doubt the persons who took part in the actions and the authors who originally described them were absolutely unconscious that they were types, but, when one action after another can be brought into line as contributing to a series of what we call types, I think we may reasonably conclude that men in the later generations of the world were intended under the Divine guidance to see that all those actions had a meaning beyond what they had to their own time, which was to meet with its full verification in later times. But the consequence of all this was that men failed to look upon the patriarchs as men of like passions with themselves moving across the field of history. Now again, from quite a different motive, we are urged to disbelieve, or, at any rate, in a great measure to ignore, their personal character, and to see in them simply puppets set up to typify various tribes and their histories.

In both cases an unequally balanced method of reasoning is at work. Eponymous ancestors, names of tribes, possible types, can all exist in the same narrative, and no one of these need necessarily oust the others.

We now reach the final section of Dr. Driver's introduction. Its subject is—

THE RELIGIOUS VALUE OF THE BOOK OF GENESIS,

and he includes under this head Inspiration and the Scope of Inspiration. Here he is constrained to admit that the Book of Genesis is unique. It "is a marvellous gallery of portraits, from whatever originals they may have been derived. There is no other nation which can show for its early history anything in the least degree resembling it" (p. lxix). If this be so, then there is at least ground for wondering, after all, whether this uniqueness may not extend in other directions as well, and include the historicity of the information, short, simple, and unembellished as it is, as to the earliest times, which the book professes to give us. It is scarcely necessary in these days to set up the doctrine of verbal inspiration in the form in which it was asserted in earlier times in order to refute it. That is to prejudice the whole discussion.

But the idea, to most Christians, of the religious value of Genesis extends far wider than critical views will carry us. They see, it is true, the Providential guidance towards the foundation of a people to perpetuate, however imperfectly the individual may have contributed his part, true religion in the world. But they see more than

this: they see the Divine purpose to regenerate the human race, and to restore its innocence, by and through an actual person, expressed more and more clearly even in those early ages (*e. g.*, *cp.* iii. 14 with xlix. 10). They, at any rate, can also see, not from one instance, but from many, how the Almighty was indicating by His providential guidance of the world's history, under types and figures, His purposes to be carried out in future ages for the redemption of mankind. If they can see all this, and the vast majority of Christians think they can do this—and spiritual insight (thank God for it) is often to be found where critical insight is lacking—then it will be a long time before they will accept the dangerous doctrine which is presented to them to-day, that in an admittedly inspired book you may have set before you religious truth and scientific and historical error. The science and the history of this book are not the science and history of the twentieth century; at the same time, we feel quite sure—and the opinion is a growing one—they are not opposed to it. The book is not in its primary intent and in its contents a scientific or a historical manual; its purpose is a much higher one, and that purpose it will be found more and more to fulfil, without in the least traversing any *absolute* truth which science or history may finally arrive at. A divinely-inspired book could, we feel sure, never do that.

I have thus far dwelt only with the introductory matter, as it presents to us the so-called results of

modern criticism. But before discussing other matters it seems to me that one point should be mentioned here.

Behind all these questions there looms a much weightier matter, which is for the most part left out of sight altogether. The religion of the inhabitants of the earliest ages of the world—was it arrived at by a process of evolution, say through fetichism, or whence did it come? If it came by evolution, and the popular forms of polytheistic religion in Egypt, Babylonia, and Greece were evolved from such baser forms, how do you account for the fact that there seem to have existed side by side with them purer esoteric forms of faith as far removed from the popular forms as the religion of a cultured, intellectual Roman Catholic Englishman is from that of an Irish or Spanish peasant or a South American? Will not analogy rather teach us that the same causes have been at work, and that the popular religion is a *corruptio optimi*, as even the esoteric form may be in a less degree?

Or, again, if religious belief is developed by an evolutionary process, how comes it that the first man, according to the Biblical records, is in close communion and intercourse—it may, indeed, be childlike intercourse, but it is none the less intercourse—with a God, to connect whom with totemism, fetichism, or animism, would be arrant blasphemy? And if we do not allow the revelation of God by Himself to man at the beginning, then it seems to me that we are perilously near to, even

if we do not actually arrive at, attributing religious untruthfulness as well as scientific untruthfulness to the Book of Genesis. Here is the *vera crux* for which, as it seems to me, there is only one solution.

Hitherto we have been discussing such subjects connected with the study of Genesis as are dealt with by Dr. Driver in the introductory part of his volume, whilst making such references as were necessary to the main body of the work. We pass on to the commentary itself and to the essays which will be found incorporated in it. First in order is placed, as is natural,

The Creation of the World,

and what is called the cosmogony of Genesis.

Here we come at once to the problems the elucidation of which is very often held to point to a divergence or opposition between science and religion. But, as has been already clearly laid down, when we read the Bible we are not reading in any particular book anything professing to form part of a scientific manual. What is described to us is narrated in popular language. When the book was written—no matter for the moment at what date—it was written by a man of his time, and not by a scientist of the twentieth century, and for men of this time. It would have been useless to have described the creation then in language such as many would understand now-a-days. And, after all, we are still, many of us, far from possessing a deep acquaintance with science, and even the scientist

himself takes up the language of the past and uses it. He still speaks of sunset and of sunrise, whilst he tells us, when he is talking scientifically, that the sun does *not* set, and that the sun does *not* rise. If it is permitted him to use such language as this in such an enlightened age, why should he put the writers of a less informed age out of court for expressing the broad facts of creation in similar language, and accuse them of contradicting scientific truth because they use the language and imagery of the time? But we must go further than this. We must investigate the question whether the writer, or writers—for we have allowed there may have been more than one—of the documents on which Genesis is founded do actually contradict or run counter to what may be taken to be absolutely ascertained scientific truths, putting on one side such *façons de parler* as we have mentioned above.

Take, for instance, the statement made in Gen. i. 5, that light came into being for the earth on the first day, whereas the sun and moon are first mentioned on the fourth day. These are simple statements; they do not deal with the question of the way in which light was produced, except to say that it was by the Divine fiat. We turn to science, and what does it tell us? The astronomer points to certain parts of infinite space in which there are what he calls *nebulæ*. There is light in the nebulæ, else we could not see them. He tells us that operations are at work there which will eventually lead to the evolution of a solar system

like our own—a sun, with its accompanying planets revolving round it. There, at any rate, just as in the case of Aurora Borealis is light before sun and moon and stars.[1] Now, to have told all this to a Jew all those centuries ago would have been unintelligible to him. But to tell him of light, and then to tell him of the sources of light for himself and for his world, would be but natural in any description of creation. There is no reason for, or need of reading into the narrative anything that it does not state; all that is claimed for it is that there is nothing in it opposed to the discoveries of modern times. The mention of the appearance of light as anterior to the creation of the sun and moon is a very different thing from the use of ordinary language about the firmament, where all that is implied is the existence of waters held up, as it were, above the earth and separated from them, whilst above these upper waters, if we compare other passages in the Scriptures, were the throne and dwelling-place of God. It is obvious that the word is used figuratively of the dome of heaven, just as much as it is used figuratively of the earth (Isa. xlii. 5, xliv. 24). To come to another point: It is absurd to say that the words "God set" the sun and moon and stars in the firmament mean that He fastened them to it (like, I suppose, bosses in a shield). The word used in the Hebrew is capable

[1] It is interesting to notice how carefully worded is the account of the Creation of the Sun, Moon and Stars when we remember that the Babylonians looked upon them as gods.

of very varied meanings, and one has only to refer to one passage (from the same document P, according to the critics) to see this. When in Gen. ix. 13 we meet with the words "I do set My bow in the cloud," are we to take them to mean, "I do fasten My rainbow to the cloud"? And yet both passages come from the same author, and we must give him the credit, with reference to the earlier one, of being able to use his eyes and to observe that the moon, at any rate, was *not* fastened to the firmament, for if it had been it would have always occupied the same relative position to the sun and the stars if they also were fastened to it.

These are but details. We come now to the cosmogony of Genesis as a whole. Now, the present writer cannot claim to any great knowledge of natural science; he can only profess to approach the subject from what he ventures to call the common-sense view of it. In the first place, then, he finds that not merely theologians, but distinguished men of science, during the last century have tried one after another[1] to establish harmony between the ascertainable facts of science and the statements of the Bible, and, though difficulties have presented themselves with regard to their different theories, and some wild assertions have been made, it does not follow that the door is closed against all attempts at reconciliation, and that the scientist is to shut himself within his own

[1] Dr. Driver mentions four attempts connected with well-known names.

barriers, and say, "No, you cannot effect anything of the kind!" For, after all, some of the statements made on behalf of science are but tentative. It must be remembered that science did not arrive at its present dogmatic assertions of scientific truth *per saltum;* on the contrary, it made many tentative hypotheses first, many of which proved to be mistaken. Just in the same way scientists or theologians may make tentative attempts at harmonizing science and the statements of the Bible; and because their particular attempts turn out to be mistaken ones, it does not follow that no reconciliation is possible. Moreover, those who question the Biblical narrative must be tied down to an exact use of terms. When it suits their purpose, the word "evolution" is made much of; on the other hand, when the theologian uses the word "creation," an attempt is made to pin him down to instantaneous work on the part of the Creator, and not to the inauguration of what is to develop gradually. It is here, I think, we should look for an explanation of the relative antiquity of vegetable and animal life, and of fishes and birds or land animals, remembering all the time that the records of geology as presented to us now can scarcely be termed exhaustive. It is just as much a reading of ideas into the narrative from outside to say that in Gen. i. 11, 12 "vegetation is complete," as it is to attempt to make of its language a scientific explanation of the origin of things.

I may, perhaps, be allowed to venture upon an

illustration of what I mean. If you ask any one who has lived a great deal in the country how often, in the course of his rambles, he has met with the body of a bird that has died a natural death, he will most probably tell you that he has seldom or never seen such a thing; and even the dead bodies of those that have perished by violent deaths disappear so rapidly that they are seldom seen. Arguing from this, it might be said that the bird population of this country is very small indeed, whereas, as a fact, we know it is not so. Well, then, are we bound to assume that there were necessarily no birds before the first appearance of them in geological strata? Again, do we even now know enough about the condensation of a nebula and the evolution of a stellar system from it to be able to say that the consolidation of its parts can only take place in one order? I venture to think not. And when one comes to the comparatively trivial question of carnivorous animals and their diet, one is tempted to ask learned men: Have they ever seen their domestic cats—carnivorous animals, if ever any are—eating, or, at any rate, chewing grass? If it were wanted for their purposes they would hail this act as a survival of an old mode of life which had been supplanted by the development of carnivorous habits in some prolonged time of drought and dried-up vegetation, and that the present dentition of the feline species is a modification of a previous one brought about by change of environment or other causes. But,

further, we would draw attention to the following quotation from a well-known text-book, Nicholson's *Manual of Zoology* (7th edition, p. 813):

"The Carnivora are adapted by their organization for a raptorial life, and for a more or less exclusively carnivorous diet, though in exceptional cases the food is not of an animal nature at all."

We must be careful, then, to see that the generalizations we are asked to accept are not too wide.

We come next to the connection of this narrative of the Creation with the Babylonian cosmogony. It would, of course, be impossible to deny, and we should not wish to do it, that such a connection in some form or other is possible, or even probable, when we consider the history of Abraham and the place from which he came. But this is far from allowing that the account of Creation in Genesis was due to theories of the origin of things invented by the Hebrews themselves, or borrowed from their neighbours, or was "derived ultimately" from the Babylonian narrative as it stands now. Many centuries ago Eusebius and other ecclesiastical writers became acquainted with earlier authors, such as Berosus, and with their account of the Babylonian cosmogony. The similarity between it and the Scriptural account was accepted by them as a matter of course. They saw no difficulty in it. It remained for the present age to make this a reason for casting doubts upon the Biblical narrative, and to express itself startled that such a correspondence should exist.

To begin with, the whole atmosphere of the two accounts is different. There is nothing to correspond to the "In the beginning God created" of Genesis (i. 1). In the tablets, on the other hand, we have an account of the evolution of the Babylonian gods. It will be remembered that we have already mentioned the two forms that religions seem inevitably to take—an esoteric and an exoteric or popular form. If the Bible is a revelation at all, then the scriptural account of the Creation may have come in the first place from Babylon, and from Abraham or his ancestors, but it will stand side by side with and in elevating contrast to the corrupter form of the revelation which prevailed in popular belief in Babylon. If the Bible does not contain a revelation, then the account of Creation is a fiction, and it does not matter the slightest what was its source or whether it was a refinement of the Babylonian narrative by a Hebrew author or not.

But then, if this be so, the destructive critics must not base anything upon it. They have no right to quote it as showing (*i. e.* I suppose, proving) "that the world was not self-originated" (p. 32), or that "it sets God above the great complex world-process." If the cosmogony is an invention of man, matter may, after all, be eternal as much as God. We must not use it to prove the relation in which matter stands to God, or even that in which the first *anthropos*, or man, stood to God. We come back to the point we asserted

before which is in opposition to part of Abbé Loisy's teaching, and is most dangerous, that a narrative can be *scientifically* opposed to the truth, *theologically* true.

It is scarcely necessary to spend much time on the question of the institution of

The Sabbath.

For many simple minds the assertion of Exod. xx. 11 will be sufficient: "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it." But we can go a little further than this. In the first place, there seems to have been something like periods of seven days in the Assyrian calendar, though in the one which exists the nineteenth day is mentioned as well as the fourteenth and twenty-first, and the term *shabattum*, so far as we know, was not applied to these days, but only to the fifteenth day of the month (Pinches, 2nd edition, p. 527). This Dr. Driver mentions; but I cannot find, secondly, that, in this connection, he mentions the occurrences of a period of seven days both in Genesis (vii. 10, viii. 10, 12) and on the Flood Tablets (ll. 130, 146). What he does say is that there is no indication or hint of the Sabbath being observed as a sacred day in pre-Mosaic times (p. 18). Now the argument from omission is a dangerous one. Institutions of a religious kind are in sacred writings

often taken for granted. Take the analogous case of the observance by Christians of the first day of the week which we find mentioned in the Acts. St. Paul, who is constantly writing about Christian practice as well as Christian doctrine, never in all his extant epistles writes a word about Sunday or its observance,[1] though we know that he preached on Sunday at a Holy Communion service (Acts xx. 7). If we had had only his epistles, which are most, if not all of them, earlier than the Acts, it might have been argued, with just as much validity as there is in the argument about the Sabbath, that there is no indication of the observance of Sunday in Pauline times; and the same might be said of all the other epistles. Such observances are taken for granted by writers of all times; it is very seldom, for instance, that any particular notice is taken of Sunday or Holy Day in English history unless there be something special connected with it—as, for instance, the Battle of Agincourt being on St. Crispin's day, so markedly recorded by Shakespeare:

> "And Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by,
> From this day to the ending of the world,
> But we in it shall be remembèrd."

Our attention must now be drawn to the second account of the Creation and to the history of the Fall of man. But before doing so we should like to bring forward what we consider to be two or

[1] The only approach to it is the laying by in store upon the first day of the week (1 Cor. xvi. 2).

three instances of perversity on the part of the modern school of critics.

1. The first words of Gen. ii. 4 are made a subscription to the previous section, instead of an introduction to the following one. It is allowed that *everywhere else* the formula stands at the head of a section. Why is it not allowed to do so here?

The answer is clear. Everywhere else the formula is attributed to the document labelled P, which is held to have contained the superscription as well. Here the formula follows an extract from P (Gen. i. 1 to ii. 3), but is succeeded by a section from J (Gen. ii. 4*b* to iv. 26). It cannot be that such a formula—for this is the argument—could have been one used in common both by J and P; therefore it must be, contrary to its usage elsewhere, turned into a subscription, and the extract from J made to begin in the middle of a sentence. That this was the reason seems to be clear from the treatment of another passage where the same difficulty occurs (xxxvii. 2). There the words, "These are the generations of Jacob. Joseph, being seventeen years old," are ascribed to P, whilst an extract from J begins, "was feeding the flock with his brethren." This is surely making mincemeat of a narrative, and we are confirmed in our opinion by finding that in that chapter various verses or parts of verses are assigned to the original documents in the following way: P—J—E—J—E—J—E—J—E—J—E—twelve changes of source in thirty-six verses!

2. In the first account of the beginnings of things the division of the work of Creation is made by what are called "days," though authorities have never agreed upon what is the exact meaning of the term in the first chapter of Genesis.[1] The division must be wrong, however; there can be no such scientifically. Granted, for the moment, it is so. Why, then, when we get to the second account, and there is no mention of "days" or of time at all, but only an outline sketch of the work of Creation contained within the short compass of three verses, are we told that its order of events is all wrong as to its chronology? I have already dealt with the difficulties suggested with regard to this narrative. I only mention it here to show the perversity of treatment of the two narratives. And this perversity continues. In Gen. ii. you may make the rivers of Eden refer to a system of canals, but in Gen. iii. you must not identify the serpent of the narrative with the Evil One.

3. The conservative critic is told that he must not read anything into the text that is not there. Well, then, neither must the destructive critic do so. Yet, take the book we are at present engaged upon, and if we examine the notes on Gen. ii. 4*b*–5 we shall find the following statements:

(*a*) "5. There was not a man to till the ground

[1] In his note on Gen. ii. 4*b*, 5, Dr. Driver says, on the words "in the day," "*i. e.* Hebrew usage compressing often what may have been actually a period of some length into a 'day' for the purpose of presenting it vividly and forcibly" (p. 37).

and, it is to be understood, to supply the deficiency of rain by artificial irrigation."

(*b*) " 10–14. Provision is made for the irrigation of the garden. The reference is implicitly to a system of canals, such as existed in Babylonia from at least the time of Hammurabi (*circa* 2300 B.C. onwards), conveying the water from a main stream to different parts of the land."

(*c*) " 19. First of all, beasts and birds are formed, also from the ground, and brought to the man to see how they would impress him, and *whether they would satisfy the required need* [*i. e.* of an help meet for him].[1] Fishes are not mentioned, *the possibility of their proving a 'help' to man being out of the question.*"

Now these statements may be some, or all of them, true or false, but they are certainly read into the Biblical narrative; and the last words of (*c*) tend to raise a smile, though very likely not intended, as if the whole story were puerile.

Other points mentioned in connection with Gen. ii. have already been dealt with. One question remains which has exercised, quite unnecessarily, we think, many minds in the past, and that is

The Site of Paradise,

or the Garden of Eden. It is quite possible—and we speak advisedly—to admit that we cannot assign

[1] The italics and words in brackets are mine.

to it a locality, and yet at the same time to assert that it existed. We have two or three points to remember which will help us to arrive at this determination. (1) The existence of the Garden of Eden, as it is described to us, can be pushed back into the countless ages of the past (compare p. 28). (2) During those countless ages the configuration of the surface of the earth may have altered considerably. Certain known facts—putting aside the action of the Flood of Gen. vi.–viii.—can be adduced to prove that such natural changes in the earth's surface have been going on and are still in progress. There is, for instance, the constant formation of land at the mouths of rivers—as in the Delta of the Nile and at the mouth of the Euphrates. Calculations have been made, based upon the historical statements of the cuneiform inscriptions, as to the annual growth of visible land at the mouth of the latter river for countless centuries. Besides, there is the constant alteration that seems to be still going on of the courses of rivers in Central Asia. Travellers like Sven Hedin convince us that this rearrangement of the earth's surface is by no means as yet completed, for they find that these rivers are constantly shifting their courses. And as for names. It by no means follows that the rivers of the Garden of Eden are necessarily the rivers of to-day that bear their names. Peoples, when they migrate, carry their place-names with them. We need but look across the Atlantic to the towns of our cousins in the United States of

America, where we can find even the name "London" reproduced; and in our country we have Old Sarum side by side with the more modern city of Sarum. We might very well reason, then, that the old names were carried out by the emigrants (of compulsion) from the Garden of Eden, wherever it was, into the world outside. The giving of names seems to have been one of the special works of man in that garden.

Another question that meets us in Gen. ii. is the origin of sex. As scientists tell us, there can be non-sexual reproduction as well as sexual reproduction, and that non-sexual reproduction can be arrived at by germination or fission (Nicholson's *Manual of Zoology*, seventh edition, p. 47). It may be some such process which is indicated or hinted at in popular language by the account of the formation of Eve, for Adam had to all intents and purposes till that formation, been in a certain true sense though not, most probably, physiologically, non-sexual. In this, again, I am very anxious not to make any dogmatic statement about the origin and formation of woman, or even to assert that Adam was in the first place sexless. I am quite aware that the instances of fission and germination known to scientists only occur in the very lowest forms of life. All I intend to assert here is (1) that a process which is recognized as possible for one form of life, or something analogous to it, may have been used by the Creator, under such special circumstances as the appearance of the first *antkropos* in

the world implies, for the creation of woman; and (2) that there is, at any rate, sufficient reason for maintaining that no one can assert positively that on this point Science and the Bible are absolutely divergent.

We turn now to the account of

The Fall and its Consequences.

The difficulties that have been felt about this narrative are a great deal older than what is called the Higher Criticism. We suppose it will always remain an open question for discussion whether the narrative is absolute history or parabolic in form. But that it represents in many ways a common tradition of large portions of the human race is quite certain. Whence came the current traditions of very many ancient nations that the human race began in a golden age of perfect happiness? Whence came the idea of a garden with wonderful trees in it? It is not a sufficient explanation to say that they are mythological. Myths are not purely and simply inventions; they have something behind them. When learned men have tried to explain some of the myths as solar, and illustrating the phenomena of the heavens, they have shown that they feel the necessity for some background for the story. And when we are told that the Babylonian and Biblical stories of golden age and paradise are mythological, we must at once ask, Is there not a Divine revelation behind them, and does not the

purest and simplest form of these narratives represent to us not so much what is mythological as a true statement—in popular language or in parabolic language, it may be, but none the less a true statement, which cannot be gainsaid, of the beginnings of the human race, its original happiness and sinlessness, and then of its terrible fall? This is far from saying that the intellectual capacities of our first parent were as great as those of the most learned men of to-day. The mind of man has been trained and cultivated through many generations. But the young child who is happy because of his ignorance of evil and because of his innocence may with much more reason give us some idea of what the state of man was before the Fall. His intellectual capacities have to be developed, but his happiness and innocence are independent of them.

The question of the speaking serpent, as of the speaking ass in the story of Balaam, is a difficulty that is made a great deal of sometimes. If the narrative of the Fall is parabolic it scarcely calls for observation. If not, then we may, I dare to think, still venture not to be afraid of dealing with it. Many will be content to accept the account as of something miraculous. But others of us who have eyes to see and minds to notice and reflect will be content to observe what *humanity* there is in the expression and in the intelligence of certain animals, and how speaking their looks are, though they do not attain to actual words. The dog in disgrace, the dog in delight at the return of his

master, the dog in pain, the dog showing by his reproachful looks a sense of unjust chastisement, shows his feelings in a most human way, and so do other animals as well. The dog speaks to us when he draws our attention to something which he wishes us to see; the cat does the same when she brings her slaughtered victim and lays it at our door. And this may be what is meant, though expressed in more direct and poetical language than we of these latter days are used to, by the speaking of the serpent and the ass.[1] So Job says of the war-horse, "As oft as the trumpet soundeth, he saith, Aha!" (xxxix. 25); man interprets the noise the horse, makes as a kind of equine shout of exaltation. It may be, then, that in these verses the necessary interpretation is put upon the looks, or attitude,[2] or even the voice (in the case of the ass) of the animal, and is expressed for us, just as we are intended to make it for ourselves in the passage from Job quoted above. Language goes one step further still when

[1] It is the word אמר, a word of much wider significance than דבר, that is used both in Gen. iii. and in Num. xxii.

[2] This might be illustrated from the Babylonian cylinder, which is supposed to represent the story of the Temptation, one feature of which is a serpent coiling upwards by a fruit-tree, as if to draw attention to its fruit, whilst two figures are seated by the tree (see Ball's *Light from the East*, p. 25). It is, however, matter for grave doubt whether the design on the cylinder refers to the Fall at all. With regard to the Balaam story it must be remembered that in the New Testament we are told that "a dumb ass spake with man's voice and stayed the madness of the prophet" (2 Pet. ii. 16). Here the Greek word for "voice" does not necessarily imply "words."

we find such language in Hebrew poetry as the following :

> "The deep saith, It is not in me :
> And the sea saith, It is not with me"
> (Job xxviii. 14)

where the same Hebrew word is used for "saith."

When we reach the Protevangelium (iii. 15), or first publication of the beginnings of what was to end in the Gospel message, the warning, disregarded in Gen. ii., is revived that "we must not read into the words more than they contain." But we venture to think that all is not made of the words which is to be found in them. Not a word is said of the far more vital importance of the *head* than of the *heel.* Herein lies, surely, the great value of the Protevangelium. The damage done by evil may be only temporary ; but evil itself is eventually to be stamped out and destroyed utterly. This is the way in which the meaning of the passage may surely be legitimately presented. We remain unsatisfied and dissatisfied when we are told that "no *victory* of the woman's seed is promised" (p. 48). This seems scarcely consistent with what we are told somewhat later : "It is, of course, true that the great and crowning defeat of man's spiritual adversary was accomplished by Him Who was in a special sense the 'seed' of the woman" (p. 57). But what apparently is meant is that we must not look upon the passage itself as in any way promising to the original hearers a personal deliverer ; and to this we demur.

We have only to look on to Gen. iv. 25 to see the word "seed" used of a particular individual; we might almost say that verse looks back to this promise.[1] Both passages are assigned to the same original source (J).

We need dwell but for a moment upon

The Cherubim.

There are two points to be noticed with regard to these creatures about whom next to nothing is known, for they, at any rate for the present, cannot be connected with certainty with anything in the non-Hebraic world. The first point is that they are not said to have been visible; and it is a mistake of artists to represent them with a sword driving Adam and Eve out of the Garden. This idea may have come first of all from the Greek version of Ezek. xxviii. 6 ("and the cherub led thee from the midst of the stones of fire"). The second point is one which brings one again (Gen. iii.) into relation with the history of Balaam's ass (both attributed to the source J). In the one we have "the Cherubim, and the flame of a sword," not, so far as we know, visible to man; in the second, we have "the angel of the Lord standing in the way, with his sword drawn in his hand" (Num. xxii. 23, 31), visible at first to the ass, who

[1] Jewish tradition in later days held this view of the passage, when every woman in turn nourished the hope that she might bear *the* seed.

is represented as a humble and innocent instrument made use of by God, but only visible to Balaam after his eyes had been opened by the Lord. Whether this was a cherub or not does not appear, and what relation the cherubim of Gen. iii. 24 bore to the two cherubim of gold of the tabernacle (Exod. xxv. 18) and the two cherubim of olive wood in the temple (1 Kings vi. 23; in 2 Chron. iii. 10 two cherubim of image work overlaid with gold) is not in any way defined.

When we leave the first three chapters of Genesis behind in our investigations into the credibility of the narrative, which we hope have not been wholly profitless, we expect to come into less troubled waters. But the modern critic never seems to be so happy as when he is upsetting cherished notions. At the same time, he occasionally omits to clear up difficulties. One could not tell, for instance, from the book with which we are more immediately concerned, that there was any difficulty as to the interpretation of the last words of Gen. iv. 25, "with *the help of* the Lord"; but such there is.

It would be impossible to deal exhaustively with all the points that are suggested by a perusal of each chapter of Genesis in succession. The following, however, may be mentioned:

1. It is implied by the commentators that Abel and Cain were uncivilized persons. This is, of course, a pure assumption. It is also asserted that no such motive as thankfulness for the fruitfulness

of the ground and of the herds and flocks is alluded to in the account of their offerings. This bare assertion is simply based upon one theory of sacrifice that is now current, and is, to say the least, far from being established. Noah, at any rate, would appear to have offered up burnt-offerings in thanksgiving for his deliverance from the Flood.

2. Many more statements are made as to the history of Cain and Abel, which to most minds will be held to be incapable of proof. Such are the following: That (*a*) according to the existing Book of Genesis it is plain that there could have been no one (in existence in the world at the time) to slay Cain; and (*b*) that the presence of Jehovah is regarded as confined to the garden of Eden and its immediate neighbourhood.

We have dealt partly with the former of these statements on a previous page. As to the second of the statements mentioned above, we find the Lord's presence recognized in later passages of the same document (J), and not limited to that particular locality.

Again, it is assumed that Cain had a wife before the murder of Abel. Where the wife came from we are not told. More than one explanation can be given; we have already suggested one. A considerable number of inhabitants is not, as is asserted, necessarily required by the statement of chap. iv. 14, "whosoever findeth me shall slay me."

3. The statement as to the discovery of certain arts and institutions is ascribed to the inventive

faculties of the Hebrews of a later day ; and these discoverers are to be regarded as in their origin demi-gods or heroes, whose semi-divinity was cut out of the tradition about them by these same later Hebrews. At least, that is the explanation which Dr. Driver adopts as his own, using the language of the present Bishop of Winchester.[1] Although there may have been, as no doubt there were, such inventors, who were surrounded in later times among some peoples with a heroic or semi-divine atmosphere, it does not follow that there was not a human element behind them. Certainly there is nothing heroic, to say nothing of anything semi-divine, about the inventors of Gen. iv. Moreover, we need not be astonished by the omission of the Stone Age. The fact is, as we have asserted before, that both before and behind these inventors there may be many cycles of ages in the world's history. At any rate, it is interesting to note that the narrative here recognizes with the scientists a *Bronze*[2] and *Iron* Age ; it only omits to tell us what preceded it. That did not fall within its scope.

A caution may also be given. We must not imagine, because the birth of Seth is not mentioned sooner, that therefore it did not take place till the days of Lamech. The author of Genesis, or of the chronicle called J, was anxious to dismiss the history of Cain and his descendants from his

[1] *Early Narratives of Genesis*, p. 81.

[2] Bronze or copper (R.V., marg.), not brass, is the right rendering in modern English of the word used in Gen. iv. 22.

narrative, and therefore dealt with them first. Chap. iv. 25 really connects itself with chap. iv. 15. Further still, it is to be noticed that this part of the narrative owes nothing, so far as we know, to Babylon, and has most affinity with other Semitic legends, perhaps derived from the Bible narrative or running parallel to it (Eus., *P. E.*, i. 10).

4. It will surely appear unreasonable or almost puerile to most minds that they should be asked the question, "Was the knowledge of these arts preserved in the ark, or had they to be rediscovered afterwards?" and then, being given the answer, "No; both these alternatives are improbable," that they should be told that behind the narrative as they read it were two cycles of traditions, one of which had no Flood in it, and that, too, when it is admitted that the tradition of a Flood was almost universally prevalent in the East.

We have little to add to what we have said already as to the next chapters of Genesis. Considering how little we know about man's environment in the earliest ages of the history of the human race, it seems a somewhat rash assertion to make that "longevity, such as is here described, is physiologically incompatible with the structure of the human body" (p. 75). Many might be found, we imagine, to assert the contrary. The conditions of life may have been, and doubtless were, so different from those of the present time that it is difficult to say what might be then compatible or

incompatible with the structure of the human body. As it is, science now-a-days sometimes occupies itself with endeavours to prove the reverse, and the possibility of prolonging human life. But even if it be so, there are other ways of explaining the statements made, as we have seen on a previous page. It must be remembered that no critic of any sort claims to know upon what principle the figures given were computed. And instead of saying, as some do, that the names and narrative were derived from the Babylonian stories, we should be inclined to think it more reasonable to infer that the Babylonian form of the history, especially considering its character,[1] was a corruption of the account which we have in a much purer and more original form in Genesis. There is no doubt a tradition common to both ; but the Scriptural one is so much more modest in its assertions and probable in its circumstances that we look to it as without doubt containing a more reasonable form of that which has been exaggerated for the aggrandizement in popular opinion of the Babylonian kingdom. The differences between the narratives are thus accounted for, and are as noticeable as their agreements.

Once again, we have already had something to say about the sons of God and the daughters of men. As to their giant issue, though no traces of

[1] For instance, according to Berosus' account of the Babylonian records, there were ten kings before the Flood whose united reigns amounted to 420,000 years.

any such race have been found, we cannot see why they need be treated as if it were impossible that such could have existed. Several of the mammals existing upon the face of the earth at the present time can claim relationship with beasts of much more gigantic form in the earlier days of the world's history. Our museums are witnesses to that, and the discoveries of such creatures as the elephants embedded, flesh as well as bones, in the tundras of Siberia, and the fragments of the flesh and skin of a gigantic form of sloth in the caves of Patagonia. If this be so, there may very well have been *anthropoids*, if not *anthropoi*, of considerably greater stature than any existing in the world at the present time, especially when we remember the differences of stature that do occur in men of different races at the present time.[1]

I now turn to the

History of the Flood,

with which I have already dealt in part. It remains to consider the alleged difference which, it is asserted, exists between the various documents as to the duration of the Flood. Of course, if the fragments of the so-called P and J be taken by themselves as they stand, as if each contained the whole narrative as to the Flood, and not only a part, it is possible to make out that P's flood lasted one year and eleven days and J's sixty-one

[1] There is at the present moment on exhibition in London a man who is 9 ft. 3 in. in height.

days. But this was not what the writer who combined the records, if they were so combined, intended. To him they were sections combined to make up a whole, and the whole and the parts, if we allow thirty days to a month, are perfectly consistent and concordant. The years are reckoned by those of Noah's life, commencing with his six hundredth birthday. The first seven days of the year (vii. 10) are days of waiting. Then the rain begins to fall, and for forty days and forty nights, till the seventeenth day of the second month (vii. 11), follow days of combined incessant descent of rain and efflux of water from the fountains of the earth (vii. 11). At the end of those forty days there are 150 days, during which there is no perceptible diminution of the flood (vii. 24). This makes 197 days in all, equivalent to six months and seventeen days of the seventh month (viii. 4). Then the ark rests on the mountains of Ararat. In that district there is a mountain, if identical with the Mount Ararat of to-day, standing alone, with its lofty peak of about 17,000 feet.[1] Then the subsidence of the waters continues till the first day of the tenth month (viii. 5), when the lower heights and hills appeared above the water. The cautious Noah waits forty days more (this brings us to the tenth day of the eleventh month), and after three weeks more (here we arrive at the first day of the first month, Noah's

[1] Mount Ararat is apparently about 12,000 feet higher than any of the neighbouring mountains.

six hundred and first birthday) the surface of the ground is dry (viii. 13), though it is not till another eight weeks (viii. 14) have passed that the earth can be called dry. If these calculations are right, no inconsistency on this ground can be asserted between the two documents. We have already drawn attention to the many occurrences of weeks of seven days in the narrative.

The whole narrative, then, whether derived from other sources or not, is consistent with itself in its marks of time.

As to the Flood itself, the following statements may, I think, be made without gainsaying: (1) The date of the Flood cannot be fixed from the Biblical statements, if what we have said already deserves consideration, at either *circa* 2501 B.C. or (LXX) *circa* 3066 B.C. It may have been an event far away earlier than that. (2) The Ararat of Gen. viii. 4 is not a mountain, but a district, and need not necessarily be the Armenia of to-day, though it was identified with it in later times. The narrative does not, as we have assumed above for argumentative purposes it does, presuppose one high mountain several thousand feet higher than anything round about it, but rather the contrary. (3) The historical character of the Flood is implied by the Flood stories current in many different parts of our globe, for the attempts to explain away such a universal belief are not convincing (see, *e.g.* Driver, p. 102). Not least among these Flood stories is the narrative of the Baby-

lonian tablets. But, because we acknowledge this, it does not follow that the Bible story *must be* derived from the Babylonian. It is equally possible to assert that they both came from an earlier source, which has been much more elaborated and dramatized in its Babylonian form. (4) What remains alone open for discussion, and always will so remain, is whether the Flood was a universal one—and this seems the most difficult theory to maintain—or whether it was a Flood in a far-off cycle of the ages of the world's history, which only affected the parts of the world then inhabited by reasoning man. If this latter view be adopted, and Oriental modes of description be taken into account, we do not think that there need be any difficulty in accepting the historical character of the narrative.

I have already said most of what requires to be said about

The Table of Nations

in Gen. x.[1] Let me again, however, emphasize the fact that there is no necessity whatever to date this chapter as referring to a period about 2500 B.C. or (LXX) 3066. We cannot date it at all. As to eponymous ancestors being imaginary persons, it is,

[1] It is interesting, by the way, to notice as an undesigned coincidence between natural science and the history of Genesis that Noah's cultivation of the vine took place in a region not far removed from that to which it has been traced in its uncultivated state (Driver, p. 108).

to say the least of it, suspicious that nations so widely differing from one another as the ancient Greeks and Hebrews should have both invented the same notion. There must surely have been something to warrant the idea. Such individuals could scarcely have been the invention of minds and temperaments so varied. If these eponymous ancestors are real, then it may be possible to account for the Hamitic origin of Canaan, and of the peoples and towns that are represented as coming from him. It may be that in them there is a mixture of Hamitic and Semitic blood; and it should be remembered in this connection that the Old Testament knows nothing of the name Phœnicia or of Phœnicians. It is arguable that the Bible account points to a Hamitic aboriginal tribe gradually absorbed by a Semitic immigration.[1] There is much still to be cleared up before we can accurately say what is meant, for instance, by such names as "the Amorite," "the Hittite," and "the Girgashite." At any rate, we may remember that the Philistines were certainly not, neither does the Old Testament make them, Semitic. We meet with another undesigned coincidence with our view of the very early times to which this chapter goes back in Dr. Driver's note on the name Elam (p. 128). Elam in Gen. x. 22 is made Semitic in

[1] It is noticeable that in another connection (p. 108) Dr. Driver draws attention to the fact that Sir R. F. Burton remarked upon the Egyptian physiognomy of some of the Bedouin clans of Sinai observable at the present day.

origin. "Racially," says Dr. Driver, "the Elamites were entirely distinct from the Semites." That condemns the Bible narrative of being unhistorical. But if we look a little furthur on in the note we find these words: "It is true inscriptions recently discovered seem to have shown that *in very early times* [the italics are mine] Elam was peopled by Semites . . . and that the non-Semitic Elamites spoken of above only acquired mastery over it at a period approaching 2300 B.C." So, then, the Bible is right after all. But what says the commentator? "The fact is not one which the writer of the verse is very likely to have known" (p. 128). The mode of treatment implied here stands surely self-condemned. Surely we may find rather an argument here for the great antiquity of the source P.

We turn now to the narrative concerning

The Tower of Babel.

One of the first things we are told is that "the incident which it describes is placed shortly after the Flood" (p. 133). Now, to begin with, in Gen. xi. 1–9 there is not a single chronological note of any sort. Moreover, in his note on Gen. x. 25, Dr. Driver tells us that it is most likely that the division of the earth connected with the name of Peleg (*loc. cit.*) is the dispersion of this passage. Now, Peleg was the fourth in descent from Shem. If the allusion is right, the narrator can hardly have intended to place the dispersion *shortly* after the Flood. A further inconsistency appears in the

notes. He does not allow, as some of his fellow-critics would wish to assert, that there is anything polytheistic about the Divine name Elohim with its plural form. But when Jehovah in the narrative before us is represented as saying, "Let us go down" (Gen. xi. 7), he says that "the conception of Deity is . . . perhaps imperfectly disengaged from polytheism" (p. 134). If I may venture to conjecture, it seems that the reason—perhaps an unconscious one—for the different treatment of the two passages is this: the latter passage comes from an earlier source (J) than the former one (from P). What, therefore, might be possible, from a critic's point of view, in the earlier document (J) is scarcely possible in the later (P).

One more curious feature of the whole story is that there is nothing in it apparently of Babylonian origin. Just when we should expect it most, if we believe, as some do, that the Biblical narrative is based upon Babylonian myths, our authorities on that subject desert us, and will not provide us with anything to fall back upon even in the remotest way connected with it. It would not affect us at all if tablets giving an account similar to the Bible were discovered; but it must be a difficulty to others that they cannot bring any to bear upon this narrative.

And as to the Confusion of Tongues, there is one explanation of that event, which seems to point in the right direction, though it is scarcely sufficient by itself. It is that when the people

were collected together from all sides to build a great common city, and began to try and hold intercourse with one another as they built, it was found that by lapse of time and distance their language had become so different that they could not sufficiently understand each other, and utter confusion arose.

The rest of the Book of Genesis need not detain us very long. It is scarcely necessary to discuss the question whether the names Abraham, Isaac, etc., represent tribes rather than individuals, and whether their marriages and offspring represent tribal movements. No proof of such views can be found in the narrative, which rather, in the case of all the prominent individuals mentioned in it, gives us a living, natural picture of persons of distinct individuality and character.

It is a relief to find that Dr. Driver points out the distinction between the Jewish rite of circumcision and that institution among other nations, and also allows us to believe in an overthrow of the cities of the Plain in the days of Abraham, placing their sites under the shallow waters at the southern extremity of the Dead Sea. But it is also interesting to see what can be read into the narrative when it is thought desirable. In Gen. xiv. 10 we are told that "the petroleum oozed out from holes in the ground, which proved fatal to the retreating army" (!). This is an exposition of "the vale of Siddim was full of slime-pits" (marg., bitumen pits).

Certain passages, however, call for more or less of notice. We take first, that one which stands in a marked way by itself, Gen. xiv., which is considered to have been derived from a special source (SS, according to Dr. Driver). At one time this was supposed to be one of the most ancient documents embodied in the Pentateuch. Now it is attributed to the same period as P—the age of Ezekiel and the exile. Some day, perhaps, with another swing of the pendulum of critical opinion, it may again be relegated to an earlier age.

That the names of the four Kings of the East mentioned in it are more than possible ones for the period referred to in this chapter seems to be established beyond any reasonable doubt. Professor Sayce's chronology makes the reign of Hammurabi—with whom Amraphel is identified by many—extend from 2376 to 2333 B.C. According to the Bible narrative in the Hebrew text, the call of Abraham must have taken place—we use Dr. Driver's figures (Introd. p. xxviii)—in 2136 B.C. This makes Hammurabi's date too early for him to be a contemporary of Abraham by about 200 years. But we must remember that after all the Babylonian chronology is no more absolutely certain than the Biblical. In fact, dates so late as "*circa* 2200 (King), 2130–2087 (Hommel)," have been given for Hammurabi's reign. The names of two, and it may be of three, if Chedorlaomer is rightly identified, of the Kings of the East mentioned in this narrative occur as contemporaries on the

inscriptions. This all tells in favour of the narrative being historical, though it does not prove the historicity of its actual details.

Of Melchizedek nothing is known outside the narrative of this chapter; but because the name may mean "My King is Zedek, *i.e.* Righteousness," and because a deity named "Sydyc" is ascribed to the Phœnicians by Philo Byblius (in Eus., *P. E.*, 35*a*), it is not therefore necessary to put these two things together and make him an idolater, and to say, as some would, that the title "God Most High" was that of an ancient Canaanite deity. The name of the priest-king and of his God imply, at any rate, a supereminent deity.

With regard to the question of the duplication or even triplication of a narrative, which is all traced back to one original story, and one only, it would appear to be a very prosaic way of dealing with such narratives. Considering the circumstances of the times to which the stories refer, it seems certainly far from being improbable that such difficulties as are recorded to have occurred (xii. 10–20, xx., xxvi. 6–11) might very well have presented themselves more than once, and that the temptation to avoid them by a similar ruse may have occurred not only to more than one patriarch, but also to the same patriarch more than once. Abraham is not the only person in the world's history who has uttered the same untruth or the same half-truth more than once.[1] Each narrative,

[1] How often now-a-days, in the world of politics as well as

it will be observed, has its own peculiar features. The two that are attributed to the same source (J) differ materially, as do also the two that are attributed to the same locality, Gerar. Abimelech and Phicol may have been official names, and therefore may have done duty for more than one individual, and the repetition of the name Beersheba in Gen. xxvi. 33 may simply mean that by the fact of the name Shibah being given to the well, the desirability of still attaching the name of Beersheba to the place was established. So also is it with other supposed duplications of one historical event.

In the history of Joseph and his captivity great stress is laid upon the variations in details between the two sources. It is acknowledged that the two versions in the existing narrative "are harmonized (though imperfectly)." Patient treatment of the difficulties will enable us to say that the two versions are harmonious rather than harmonized. For instance, to take one point, it is said (p. 332) that Joseph is drawn up by Midianites [from the pit] without his brothers' knowledge." The only brother who was necessarily not a witness to this was Reuben; the rest may, so far as the existing narrative is concerned, well have been witnesses of the transaction.

---

in the world of religion, are half-truths made to do duty for whole ones, and repeated even when their imperfect character has been exposed.

We now turn to the chapter containing

JACOB'S BLESSING.

"Jacob called unto his sons, and said, Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you that which shall befall you in the latter days" (Gen. xlix. 1), and then follow his words of blessing.

That is quite untrue, we are told now-a-days. The words are an invention of a later age. Jacob never said them: they were put into his mouth in the time of the Judges, or, perhaps, of David. He could never have uttered the last two clauses of ver. 7. It is tolerably certain that the author was a poet of the Tribe of Judah, for he ranks that tribe evidently as the premier one.

It is not, however, at all clear that we are bound to accept all this. We are dealing with a book that does not claim to be a complete history, but which is in itself leading us by a kind of philosophy of history—doubtless not entirely realized by the author, but inspired by its Divine Source—up to the formation of a "peculiar people." We can well imagine, then, the head of his family, with an intimate knowledge of the characteristics of his twelve sons, looking forward to the development of a federation, as we should call it now, of twelve tribes under the headship of one, each tribe at the same time retaining its own peculiar attributes. This seems just as probable a theory as the other, if we once allow any kind of inspiration at all, such as will include some insight into the future.

Much has been made of the idea that this chapter has in it reminiscences of the Song of Deborah, or *vice versa*. But if this be so, how is it that in Gen. xlix. 13 it is said that "Zebulun shall dwell at the haven of the sea," while in Judg. v. 17 it is Asher who "sat still at the haven of the sea"? The statements are clothed in the same language, but they are different. Why is Judah made so much of in Gen. xlix., where there is good reason for it, if Jacob uttered the words, because of the part which Judah took with regard to Joseph, Jacob's favourite son, while Judah is not mentioned in Judg. v.? Why is Issachar made "to prefer ease to independence" in Gen. xlix. 14, 15, whilst in Judg. v. 15 Issachar is made to be most eager in the fight for independence? Why in Gen. xlix. 14 should Issachar crouch down between the sheep-fold, whilst in Judg. v. 16 it is Reuben that sits among the sheep-folds. There is just that independence which proclaims originality. All this is just what would not have happened if one poem had been dependent upon the other. There is also a certain amount of personal allusion to the founder of the tribe—*e.g.* in the case of Reuben, Simeon, and Levi—which would scarcely have found place in a composition such as this, if it had been of a later age. We are glad, by the way, to be allowed to think that, at any rate in a limited way, the words of Gen. xlix. 10 are Messianic.

We have now reached the end of our treatment of the difficulties and objections that have been

raised to the authenticity and historicity of the Book of Genesis. Putting on one side a very few isolated clauses, such as "before there reigned any king over the children of Israel" (Gen. xxxvi. 31), which, it is admitted by all critics alike, may have been later additions to the text, having first of all, perhaps, been marginal notes at the side of a manuscript, it is contended by the present writer that, granting that previous sources may have been used, there is nothing in this book which requires us to give it any later date than that which has always been assigned to it in earlier times, and to which the Jews of our Lord's day, as well as those before them, and our Lord Himself, attributed it.

Further still, if it be allowed that it bears traces of having been compiled from various sources, those sources, it is contended, though their style and language may be different, can in no sense be said to be contradictory. If such were the case, how is it that, with all the attention that has always been paid to it, such contradictions have not been found out before? An attempt has been made to show that such contradictions and discrepancies are capable of explanation, and they have, so far as is possible, been treated one by one. And, in fine, if it be a *mosaic* cunningly put together by the fitting in of each fragment to make a whole, it is artistically done, and can still be called *Mosaic* in another sense.

It is sometimes said: After all, you must take a

wider and more general view, and look for general principles. Of course a general view and general principles must be looked for. But these can only be arrived at by inductive methods and by the study of details. That is why I venture to think anything like the present investigation is important. The treatment of the details must come first; afterwards generalizations can be arrived at; and after that, if the generalizations are not borne out by a further examination of the details, they cannot command our assent.

One of the great dangers of the present school of Biblical critics seems to be their subjective treatment and handling of the books of the Bible. They first of all lay down what they imagine to be the possibilities of any particular age in history, and then if the narratives referring to the period do not agree with their preconceptions, so much the worse for the history concerned: it is an invention of a later time. I may take an illustration of this from another period of Scripture history. The social and religious life of the Hebrew nation and its environment in the days of David are held to have been such that any outburst or production of religious poetry such as is contained in the Psalms assigned to him cannot have been possible. *Ergo*, David did not compose any of the Psalms attributed to him. Such a style of argument would certainly not carry weight in any other subject than Biblical Criticism. It is enough, surely, in answer to say: (1) That we do not know enough about the

conditions of life in David's time to make such an assertion at all; and (2) that in all ages, even if such an assertion were generally true, men in advance of their age and with great and wonderful gifts have constantly in the world's history been raised up by Divine Providence to occupy certain spheres and do certain work; and David may have been one of these.

I should like to restate here a view which I think is extremely probable as to the Hebrew names of God which occur in the Old Testament. I propose to deal only with those four, and particularly with the last two of the four, which rank by themselves —El, Eloah (with plural Elohim), Jah, Jehovah, if I may be allowed for the moment to use the old form. The rest of the names, like Shaddai, Elyon, etc., are more or less of the nature of epithets.

It has been often asserted that Eloah is a form connected with El, and perhaps of later origin, giving more dignity than the simpler form. If this be so, then it is equally possible that Jah was the earliest form and Jehovah also a more magnificent name. There are reasons for supposing that Jah was like El, the more primitive form. If we look outside the Scriptures it has, perhaps, its analogue in the Assyrian Ea or Aa, who is "the hero of the earlier episodes of the Creation story" (King, *Seven Tablets of Creation*, p. xxxvii). In the Scriptures themselves Jah is evidently treated as an ancient name of God: "Jah is . . . my father's

God, and I will exalt Him" (Exod. xv. 2; compare Isa. xii. 2 and Ps. cxviii. 14). "His name is Jah" (Ps. lxviii. 4).

Jehovah, then, may be an intensive form of Jah, and may have primarily been יהיה, and not יהוה. This would account for the connection implied between the name and the verb היה, *not* הוה. It is asserted that הוה is older than היה; but occurrences of היה are to be found earlier than any of הוה. Whichever may be the earlier form, it seems to me quite clear that when the Pentateuch was written in its present form, and even before that, there was not much distinction made between י and ו, for we have, for instance, Peniel and Penuel in two successive verses in Genesis (xxxii. 30, 31), both ascribed to J. This will allow us, then, not to attach much weight to the variation between ו and י in Exod. iii.; and יהוה may be a later form which took the place of יהיה, when perhaps, הוה became the common form of the verb, and not היה.

If יהיה is the original form of the name, then:

1. It may be taken as an intensive form of יה, for which intensive form we have analogies in the proper names of persons, such as Chalcol (1 Kings iv. 31), Bakbuk (Ezra ii. 51), Harhur (Ezra ii. 5; Neh. vii. 53). If that were so, then a Jew need not hesitate to utter the name Jah; while he would not utter the name Jehovah; whereas if Jah had been a contraction from Jehovah, the same treatment would surely have been given to it.

2. It may still actually occur in the Hebrew

Bible. In Isa. xxxviii. 11 יה יה occurs where one Divine name would give the best sense, and subterfuges have to be adopted to explain the form away—either (*a*) that it is a dittograph, or (*b*) that we must insert with the Revised Version something between the two names: "I shall not see the Lord, *even* the Lord in the land of the living." There are two other places (Isa. xii. 2; xxvi. 4) where, with Isa. xxxviii. 11 before us, it might reasonably be contended that יהיה originally stood. The combination "Jah Jehovah" does not seem a very happy one, even though we meet with the combination "Jah Elohim" in Ps. lxviii. 19, for the one name there may be interpretative of the other. It seems more easy to imagine that, as in Isa. xxxviii. 11, so in these two passages, יהיה stood at first, and that when that form of the name ceased to be used and was generally forgotten, and יהוה was substituted for it, יהיה may have been written יה יה, and so יה יהוה became the established reading.

In bringing this short essay to a conclusion, the impression remaining on the mind of the writer is that he has found nothing in the Book as a whole to disprove the traditional view that it belongs to the period to which it was assigned—the age of Moses. At any rate, he thinks that what he has said deserves some consideration. There is so much that is at all times fashionable with the men of a particular time, and which is accepted by many because it is fashionable: whilst, at the same time,

the opposite point of view is ignored or disregarded. This is not the way in which the problems of Biblical criticism should be handled. Before a new theory is accepted, it should be subject to the most searching criticism, and in a case where the faith of many is involved, at any rate reserve and caution should be exercised. It is better about such things to withhold assent and to keep the mind in suspense for the time rather than to accept on the authority of others, however famous, dogmatic statements as to what is really still *sub judice.*

ADDENDUM

It has been assumed by some critics that, because the Pentateuch or Deuteronomy was found in the Temple by Hilkiah, it cannot have been as ancient as the days of Moses. There are many things that may be said with reference to this. To begin with, it is assumed that the discovery was a lucky find and not the result of a search. Now we must remember that the date of this discovery was 75 years or thereabouts after the death of Hezekiah. During that interval, with the exception of the short period of Manasseh's repentance, the state of true religion had been deplorable. With altars of various sorts actually in the house and in the two courts of the house of the Lord (2 Kings xxi. 4, 5), it is no wonder if the books of the law had to be hidden away with other sacred books, and, after so long a time, search was necessary for them to be found. It is noticeable, too, that in the account of Manasseh's reign and of his idolatries, reference is made to declarations made to David and Solomon about obscuring " all the law that my servant Moses commanded them " (2 Kings xxi. 8). Moreover we cannot, I think, find an undesigned coincidence to strengthen the view that the Book discovered, whatever its contents were, was an ancient one. There were two revivals of

religion and religious life in the later years of the kingdom of Judah ; one in Hezekiah's reign and in Josiah's. Now we read (Prov. xxv.) of " the proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah king of Judah copied out," and of the discovery in Josiah's reign of a book identical with the whole or part of the Pentateuch. This seems with great probability to point in the following direction. In Hezekiah's reign investigations into a chest or collection of old documents, which, no doubt, were at the bottom. This investigation reached as far as to occasion the editing of a document of Solomon's time : but something, perhaps the death of Hezekiah, put an end to the period of research. In Josiah's reign the research was resumed, and a still older stratum of documents was exhumed, which upon examination proved to be the Pentateuch or Deuteronomy. This seems to be a reasonable explanation of the circumstances actually narrated ; and it may be illustrated by what happened to Bishop Stubbs in the Chapter House of Saint Paul's under date Sept. 22, 1880, of which the following is an account :—

In the Chapter House, we made a great find. In the garret at the top, through a trap-door, we found a great mass of papers. The largest portion consisted of Wills, Bonds and Inventories, from 1660 to 1710, chiefly if not entirely the Wills proved in the Court of the Dean and Chapter : about 2,000 Wills, I think, and countless Bonds, etc. There was also a quantity of old leases and Court Rolls. But the great thing was a chest of Charters,

chiefly belonging to the Chantries of St. Paul's; but also containing bills, letters, statutes, proceedings on election of bishops, and every sort of illustrative early writing from 1100 onwards—two or three Charters of Ralph de Diceto among them. There were about 150 small bundles in the chest labelled neatly, but very dirty. Apparently they had been last looked at by Dugdale, whose marks were on some of the charters, and must have been put by about his time. Archdeacon Hale, of course, cannot have known of their existence, and I see no reason to doubt that they have been lost for at least 200 years. . . . They are originals in all cases, no copies. Besides these there are one or two books—one containing a mass of letters between Cecil and Walsingham in 1570–72, on the design of putting the Queen of Scots to death; and another of memoranda by Dean Nowell, but no Registers.

In this case, as in the other, we have documents of importance, each in their kind, which, owing to neglect and indifference due to the fashion of the time, have been practically forgotten. In each case, theoretically, they would have been supposed to have been in existence somewhere; but the use of them had, for the time, passed away.

THE END

INDEX

OF PASSAGES IN GENESIS REFERRED TO

CHAP. VERSE	PAGE
1	18, 55
1	52
5	46
9	18
11, 12	49
2	18, 55, 56, 57, 59, 63
4, 5	56
5	18, 56
7	19
10–14	57
19	19, 57
21	19
3	55, 56, 62, 64
14	43
15	63
24	65
4	20, 55, 67
4	20
14	66
15	68
22	67
23	27
25	64, 65, 68
5	29
6	58
7 10	53, 71
11	71
24	71
8 4	71, 72
5	71
13	18, 72
14	18, 72
9 13	48
10	39, 73
22	74
25	75
11	30
1–9	75
7	76
10–26	29
12 4	23
10–20	79
11	23
14	78
10	77
14	41
15 13	32
17 16–19	20

CHAP. VERSE	PAGE
17 17	23
18 9-15	20, 21
10	21
20	79
21 15	23
22 21	39
24 59	26
67	24
25	39
2–4	39
6	39
26 6–11	79
33	80
34, 35	25
27	24
2	24
46	25
32 3	22
30, 31	86
33 16	22
35 8	25
21	22
27–29	25
36 6	22
31	17, 83
37	27
2	24, 55
24	24
26	27
38	26, 27
41 46	24
42 13	27
44 20	27
46 21	27
49 1	81
7	81
8–12	27
10	43, 82
13	82
14	82
14, 15	82

RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
BREAD STREET HILL, E.C., AND
BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.

RECENT EVIDENTIAL PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

"The Evidence of Things not Seen." I. From Nature. II. From Revelation. By J. A. FLEMING, D.Sc., F.R.S. Small post 8vo, paper, 6*d.*; cloth, 1*s.*

Battle of Belief, The. A Review of the present aspects of the Conflict. By the Rev. NEVISON LORAINE. Introduction by the Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF LONDON. Third Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Crown 8vo, cloth boards. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Evolution and the Holy Scriptures. Being Addresses delivered by the Ven. JAMES M. WILSON, D.D. Medium 8vo, paper cover. 6*d.* [*A reprint of papers on this and kindred subjects. It has a special importance at the present time.*]

Jesus Christ the Supreme Factor in History. By the Rev. G. S. STREATFEILD. Small post 8vo, paper cover. 2*d.* [*Shows that the Person of our Lord is unique in history, and carries in itself a conviction of His Divine Origin.*]

Our Lord's Virgin Birth and the Criticism of To-day. By the Rev. R. J. KNOWLING, D.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in King's College and Boyle Lecturer. Crown 8vo, cloth boards. 1*s.* 6*d.* [*A timely and able contribution on this subject.*]

Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia, The. By THEOPHILUS G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S. Second Edition, Revised with Appendices and Notes. With several Illustrations. Large post 8vo, cloth boards. 7*s.* 6*d.* [*Applies to the criticisms of the Old Testament the most recent discoveries in the field of archæology.*]

The Babylonian Excavations and Early Bible History. By Professor KITTEL, of Leipzig. Translated from the German by EDMUND MCCLURE, M.A. Edited, with Preface, by H. WACE, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. Sm. post 8vo, paper cover. 6*d.*

"Higher Criticism," The, and the Verdict of the Monuments. By the Rev. A. H. SAYCE, Professor of Assyriology, Oxford. Fifth Edition. Demy 8vo, buckram, bevelled boards. 7*s.* 6*d.* [*Applies to the so-called "Higher Criticism" of the Bible the results of recent archæological research: for the General Reader.*]

Patriarchal Palestine. By the Rev. Professor SAYCE. Crown 8vo, with Map, buckram boards. 4*s.* [*Gives the result of recent research as to the condition of Palestine in the time of the Patriarchs.*]

Hebrew Tradition (The Ancient), as Illustrated by the Monuments. A protest against the Modern School of Old Testament Criticism. By Dr. FRITZ HOMMEL, Professor of the Semitic Languages in the University of Munich. Translated from the German by EDMUND MCCLURE, M.A., and LEONARD CROSSLÉ. With Map. Large post 8vo, buckram boards. 5*s.* [*Deals from an entirely new point of view with the Graf-Wellhausen position, and shows that it is utterly untenable.*]

Bible and Modern Investigation, The. Three Lectures delivered to Clergy at Norwich, at the request of the Bishop, with an Address on the Authority of Holy Scripture. By H. WACE, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. Small post 8vo, cloth. 1*s.* 6*d.*

Bible in the Light of To-day, The. By the Rev. C. CROSLEGH, D.D. Demy 8vo, cloth boards. 6*s.*

Popular Objections to Christianity. By the Right Rev. A. F. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, D.D. Small post 8vo, cloth. 6*d.* [*Deals in a bright and convincing way with current popular objections.*]

Old Testament Difficulties. By the Right Rev. A. F. WINNINGTON-INGRAM. Small post 8vo, cloth. 6*d.* [*Deals with those difficulties which Infidel Lecturers are continually bringing up: for Working men.*]

New Testament Difficulties. By the Right Rev. A. F. WINNINGTON-INGRAM. Series I. and II. Small post 8vo, cloth. 6*d.* each. [*Deals with the alleged objections of ordinary "Freethinkers."*]

Recent Attacks on the Faith. A Defence of Christianity. By Rev. J. WAKEFORD, B.D. Small post 8vo, paper cover. 3*d.* [*A popular, but striking little work dealing with recent attacks on Christianity in the "Clarion."*]

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE,
LONDON: NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE, W.C.

University of Southern California

BS1235 .R4
Redpath, Henry A. (Henry Adeney), 1848-
Modern criticism and the book of Genesi

BS
1235
R4

330541